



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/595,201 06/16/00 HAYWARD

D MAR-0003

EXAMINER

PM82/1012

MICHAEL A. CANTOR, ESQ.
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
88 DAY HILL ROAD
WINDSOR CT 06095

RODRIGUEZ, P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3613

DATE MAILED:

10/12/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Notice of Abandonment

Application No.

09/595,201

Examiner

Pam Rodriguez

Applicant(s)

HAYWARD ET AL.

Art Unit

3613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

This application is abandoned in view of:

1. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on _____.
 - (a) ☐ A reply was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of _____ month(s)) which expired on _____.
 - (b) ☐ A proposed reply was received on _____, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection.
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).
 - (c) ☐ No reply has been received.
2. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (a) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance.
 - (b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$_____ is insufficient. A balance of \$_____ is due.
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$_____. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$_____.
 - (c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.
3. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely file new formal drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).
 - (a) ☐ Proposed new formal drawings were received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.
 - (b) ☐ The proposed new formal drawings filed on _____ are not acceptable and the period for reply has expired.
 - (c) ☐ No proposed new formal drawings have been received.
4. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.
5. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.
6. ☐ The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on _____ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.
7. ☒ The reason(s) below:

Applicant failed to provide the office with a proper notification of change of address specifying applicant's new address. The mere inclusion, in a paper filed in the application for another purpose, of an address differing from the previously provided correspondence address, without mentioning the fact that an address change was made, does not constitute a proper change of address notification. See the attached MPEP sections 601.03 and 711.03©.

Pamela Rodriguez
10/9/01

2. Unavoidable Delay

As discussed above, "unavoidable" delay is the epitome of "unintentional" delay. Thus, an intentional delay precludes revival under 37 CFR 1.137(a) ("unavoidable" delay) or 37 CFR 1.137(b) ("unintentional" delay). See *Maldaque*, 10 USPQ2d at 1478.

Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of "unavoidable" delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word 'unavoidable' . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.

In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912) (quoting *Pratt*, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also *Winkler v. Ladd*, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 667-68 (D.D.C. 1963), *aff'd*, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); *Ex parte Henrich*, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." *Smith v. Mossinghoff*, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." *Haines v. Quigg*, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

A delay resulting from an error (e.g., a docketing error) on the part of an employee in the performance of a clerical function may provide the basis for a showing of "unavoidable" delay, provided it is shown that:

- (A) the error was the cause of the delay at issue;
- (B) there was in place a business routine for performing the clerical function that could reasonably be relied upon to avoid errors in its performance; and
- (C) the employee was sufficiently trained and experienced with regard to the function and routine for its performance that reliance upon such employee represented the exercise of due care.

See *In re Egbers*, 6 USPQ2d 1869, 1872 (Comm'r Pat. 1988), *rev'd on other grounds sub nom., Theodor Groz & Sohne & Ernst Bechert Nadelfabrik KG v. Quigg*, 10 USPQ2d 1787 (D.D.C. 1988); *In re Katrapat*, 6 USPQ2d 1863, 1867-68 (Comm'r Pat. 1988). For example,

where an application becomes abandoned as a consequence of a change of correspondence address (the Office action being mailed to the old, uncorrected address and failing to reach the applicant in sufficient time to permit a timely reply) an adequate showing of "unavoidable" delay will require a showing that due care was taken to adhere to the requirement for prompt notification in each concerned application of the change of address (see MPEP § 601.03), and must include an adequate showing that a timely notification of the change of address was filed in the application concerned, and in a manner reasonably calculated to call attention to the fact that it was a notification of a change of address. The following do not constitute proper notification of a change in correspondence address:

(A) the mere inclusion, in a paper filed in an application for another purpose, of an address differing from the previously provided correspondence address, without mention of the fact that an address change was being made;

(B) the notification on a paper listing plural applications as being affected (except as provided for under the Customer Number practice - see MPEP § 403); or

(C) the lack of notification, or belated notification, to the Patent and Trademark Office of the change in correspondence address.

Delay resulting from the lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP, however, does not constitute "unavoidable" delay. See *Haines*, 673 F. Supp. at 317, 5 USPQ2d at 1132; *Vincent v. Mossinghoff*, 230 USPQ 621, 624 (D.D.C. 1985); *Smith v. Diamond*, 209 USPQ 1091 (D.D.C. 1981); *Potter v. Dann*, 201 USPQ 574 (D.D.C. 1978); *Ex parte Murray*, 1891 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 130, 131 (1891). For example, as 37 CFR 1.116 and 1.135(b) are manifest that proceedings concerning an amendment after final rejection will not operate to avoid abandonment of the application in the absence of a timely and proper appeal, a delay is not "unavoidable" when the applicant simply permits the maximum extendable statutory period for reply to a final Office action to expire while awaiting a notice of allowance or other action. Likewise, as a "reasonably prudent person" would file papers or fees in compliance with 37 CFR 1.8 or 1.10 to ensure their timely filing in the PTO, as well as preserve adequate evidence of such filing, a delay caused by an applicant's failure to file papers or fees in compliance with 37 CFR 1.8 and 1.10 does not constitute "unavoidable" delay. See *Krahn*, 15 USPQ2d at 1825. Finally, a delay caused by an applicant's lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP is not rendered "unavoidable" due to: (A) the applicant's reliance upon oral advice from PTO employees; or (B) the PTO's failure to advise the applicant

601.02 Power of Attorney or Authorization of Agent

The attorney's or agent's full post office address (including ZIP code number) must be given in every power of attorney or authority of agent. The telephone number of the attorney or agent should also be included in the power. The prompt delivery of communications will thereby be facilitated.

Usually a power of attorney or authorization of agent is incorporated in the oath or declaration form. (See MPEP § 402.)

601.03 Change of Correspondence Address

Where an attorney or agent of record (or applicant, if he or she is prosecuting the application *pro se*) changes his or her correspondence address, he or she is responsible for promptly notifying the Patent and Trademark Office of the new correspondence address (including ZIP code number). The notification should also include his or her telephone number. A change of correspondence address may not be signed by an attorney or agent not of record (see MPEP § 405).

Unless the correspondence address is designated as the address associated with a Customer Number, a separate notification must be filed in each application for which a person is intended to receive communications from the Office. See MPEP § 403 for Customer Number Practice. In those instances where a change in the correspondence address of a registered attorney or agent is necessary in a plurality of applications, the notification filed in each application may be a reproduction of a properly executed, original notification. The original notice may either be sent to the Office of Enrollment and Discipline as notification to the Attorney's Roster of the change of address, or may be filed in one of the applications affected, provided that the notice includes an authorization for the public to inspect and copy the original notice in the event one of the applications containing a copy matures into a patent and the application containing the original paper is either pending or has become abandoned. Alternatively, the paper containing the original signature may be retained by applicant. See MPEP § 502.02. The copies submitted in each affected application must identify where the original paper is located.

Special care should be taken in continuation or divisional applications to ensure that any change of correspondence address in a prior application is reflected in the continuation or divisional application. For example, where a copy of the oath or declaration from the prior application is submitted for a continuation or divisional application

filed under 37 CFR 1.53(b) and the copy of the oath or declaration from the prior application designates an old correspondence address, the Office may not recognize, in the continuation or divisional application, the change of correspondence address made during the prosecution of the prior application. Applicant is required to identify the change of correspondence address in the continuation or divisional application to ensure that communications from the Office are mailed to the current correspondence address. 37 CFR 1.63(d)(4).

See MPEP § 711.03(c) for treatment of petitions to revive applications abandoned as a consequence of failure to timely receive an Office action addressed to the old correspondence address.

The required notification of change of correspondence address need take no particular form. However, it should be provided in a manner calling attention to the fact that a change of address is being made. Thus, the mere inclusion, in a paper being filed for another purpose, of an address which is different from the previously provided correspondence address, without mention of the fact that an address change is being made would not ordinarily be recognized or deemed as instructions to change the correspondence address on the file record.

The obligation (see 37 CFR 10.11) of a registered attorney or agent to notify the Attorney's Roster by letter of any change of his or her address for entry on the register is separate from the obligation to file a notice of change of address filed in individual applications. See MPEP § 402.

601.04 National Stage Requirements of the United States as a Designated Office

See MPEP Chapter 1800, especially MPEP § 1893.01 for requirements for entry into the national stage before the Designated Office or Elected Office under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT).

602 Original Oath or Declaration

35 U.S.C. 25. Declaration in lieu of oath.

(a) The Commissioner may by rule prescribe that any document to be filed in the Patent and Trademark Office and which is required by any law, rule, or other regulation to be under oath may be subscribed to by a written declaration in such form as the Commissioner may prescribe, such declaration to be in lieu of the oath otherwise required.

(b) Whenever such written declaration is used, the document must warn the declarant that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (18 U.S.C. 1001).

35 U.S.C. 26. Effect of defective execution.

Any document to be filed in the Patent and Trademark Office and which is required by any law, rule, or other regulation to be executed in a specified manner may be provisionally accepted by the Commissioner despite a defective execution, provided a properly executed document is submitted within such time as may be prescribed.